

REMARKS

Claim Objections

The present amendments cure the objections to the claims in the Office Action.

35 USC § 102

Presently pending claims 1-4, 7 and 9 stand rejected as anticipated by Natsume (U.S. 6,619,825). The Natsume reference does not anticipate the presently pending claims for at least the following reasons.

The Natsume device does not have a “common carrier substrate” as recited in Claim 1. The plurality of LEDs in the Natsume reference are mounted on substrate 26. The anticipation argument of the office action relies on two separate grids 12A and 12B anticipating the first limitation of the independent claims. As such, these two separate grids must be seen to have two separate substrates 26. Accordingly, the Natsume reference cannot anticipate the structural recitation of “a common carrier substrate” as claimed.

Next, the “shielding panel 18” of the Natsume reference (*see* column 3, line 32) is not disclosed as creating a “steeper transition of light intensity formed in a light/dark boundary” as claimed. Moreover, it cannot anticipate the “shading device” because it is not “at a boundary region between an activated grid segment and an unactivated grid segment” as claimed. Rather, the shielding device would only shield the outer periphery of the entire unit, if that.

Next, the translucent panel 22 and condenser lenses 34 and condenser lens board 36 do not include a “light scattering, light converting auxiliary material” as claimed. This material in the pending application “causes white light to be emitted from a front side of the chip cover in the direction of light propagation. The auxiliary material is evenly distributed in the cast body.” *See* page 5, paragraph 20. The elements cited in the Natsume reference are not disclosed as having any such integral material and are simply lenses for bending the light, not scattering or converting it.

35 USC § 103

The Natsume patent is also the primary reference for the 103 rejections of claims 5, 6, 8 and 10. Because the Natsume patent fails to teach the above elements recited in the claims, it cannot support a 103 rejection of them.


New Claims

New claims 11 through 20 recite further patentable distinctions over the prior art.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported in paragraphs 23 (“partitioning”) and 32 (“high gradient”) and throughout the application.

The new claims are each supported throughout the application and figures and, more particularly, as follows: New claim 11 – the figures; new claim 12 – throughout the specification and figures; new claim 13 – paragraph 19; new claim 14 – paragraph 19; new claim 15 – paragraphs 22, 23 and figures; new claim 16 – the figures; new claim 17 – paragraph 21; new claim 18 – the figures; new claim 19 – paragraph 23; and new claim 20 – paragraphs 23, 32 and throughout.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. 45, 437
Husch & Eppenger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza, Suite 600
St. Louis, MO 63105
Telephone: (314) 180-1500
Facsimile: (314) 480-1505